

entered and the product was ordered released under bond conditioned that the boxes and the enclosed circulars be destroyed and that the bottles be relabeled.

532. Misbranding of McMillan's Nomoppin and McMillan's Demytin. U. S. v. 59 Bottles of McMillan's Nomoppin and 20 Bottles of McMillan's Demytin. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3448. Sample Nos. 20924-E, 20925-E.)

On or about December 11, 1940, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia filed a libel against the above-named products at Augusta, Ga., alleging that the articles had been shipped by McMillan Drug Co. from Columbia, S. C., on or about July 17, 1940; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analyses of samples showed that Nomoppin consisted essentially of potassium arsenite and water; and that Demytin consisted essentially of calcium thiosulfate, calcium polysulfide, and water.

McMillan's Nomoppin was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling bore representations that it was efficacious as a treatment, preventive, and cure for sorehead of poultry; that it was efficacious as a tonic; that it would protect and free hens and chicks from mites; and that it would hasten moulting, brighten plumage, increase egg production, and promote more and stronger chicks, which representations were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its labeling failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of contents.

McMillan's Demytin was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling bore representations that it was efficacious as a preventive of diarrhea of poultry, and that it would free hens from "mites, etc.," promote prompter moulting, brighten plumage, increase egg production, and promote growth, strength and vigor of chicks, which representations were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

Both articles were alleged to be misbranded further in that their labels failed to bear the common or usual names of their active ingredients, and in the case of Nomoppin the label failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of arsenic that was present.

On January 1, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

533. Misbranding of veterinary remedies. U. S. v. 69 Packages of National Hog Remedy, 45 Packages of National Horse, Cow, and Mule Remedy, and 9 Packages of National Dog Worm Powder. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 2321 to 2323, incl. Sample Nos. 343-E to 345-E, incl.)

On July 8, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia filed a libel against the above-named products at Galax, Va., alleging that they had been shipped on or about May 16, 1940, by the National Hog Remedy Co. from Raleigh, N. C.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles showed that the Hog Remedy consisted essentially of sodium thiosulfate, sodium chloride, sodium sulfate, sodium bicarbonate, iron sulfate, antimony sulfide, fenugreek, flaxseed meal, charcoal, and lime; the Horse, Cow, and Mule Remedy consisted essentially of sodium chloride, sodium thiosulfate, iron sulfate, antimony sulfide, fenugreek, flaxseed meal, a cereal plant, charcoal, and lime; and the Dog Worm Powder consisted essentially of sodium chloride, sodium thiosulfate, sodium bicarbonate, sodium sulfate, iron sulfate, antimony sulfide, fenugreek, flaxseed meal, and charcoal.

The Hog Remedy was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it was a powerful tonic, flesh builder, and anthelmintic, and that it would be efficacious in the prevention and treatment of disease conditions of swine, were false and misleading, since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

The Horse, Cow, and Mule Remedy was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it was a medicinal tonic, conditioner, flesh builder, blood alterative or blood purifier, and worm remover, and that it would increase milk production and promote health, were false and misleading, since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

The Dog Worm Remedy was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it would be efficacious in the removal of all species of worms infesting dogs, were false and misleading, since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.